arXiv:1609.08230v1 [math.FA] 27 Sep 2016

# A SHORT PROOF OF THE HRT CONJECTURE FOR ALMOST EVERY (1,3) CONFIGURATION

WENCAI LIU

Abstract. Based on the proof of Demeter [5], we establish the HRT conjecture for almost every (1,3) configuration.

## 1. Introduction

Let $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{C}$ be a measurable function. We define the translations

$$T_b f(x) = f(x + b), \text{ where } b \in \mathbb{R},$$

and frequency shifts

$$M_a f(x) = e^{2\pi i a x} f(x), \text{ where } a \in \mathbb{R}.$$

The compositions of translations and frequency shifts

$$M_a T_b f(x) = e^{2\pi i a x} f(x + b), \text{ where } (a, b) \in \mathbb{R}^2$$

are called time-frequency shifts.

The associated Gabor system is

$$\mathcal{G}(f, \Lambda) := \{M_a T_b f | (a, b) \in \Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^2\}.$$

The Heil-Ramanathan-Topiwala (HRT) [9] conjecture is that any nontrivial Gabor system is linearly independent if $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ (also see [8]). That is

**HRT Conjecture:** Let $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a finite set and $0 \neq f \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$, then the associated Gabor system $\mathcal{G}(f, \Lambda)$ is linearly independent in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$. More precisely, if $0 \neq f \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ and

$$\sum_{j=1}^{N} c_j e^{2\pi i a_j x} f(x + b_j) = 0, \text{ for some } c_j \in \mathbb{C} \text{ and a.e. } x \in \mathbb{R},$$

then $c_j = 0, j = 1, 2, \cdots, N$.

**Remark:** We list some examples to show that $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ property of function $f$ is very important.

**1:** For any trigonometric polynomial $f$, there exist some finite time-frequency shifts $\Lambda$ such that the associated Gabor system $\mathcal{G}(f, \Lambda)$ is linearly dependent.

**2:** Let $f(x) = \frac{1}{2^n}$ for $x \in [n - 1, n)$, then $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^+)$ but $f \notin L^2(\mathbb{R})$. It is easy to see $f(\cdot + 1)$ and $f(\cdot)$ are linearly dependent.

Since the formulation of the HRT conjecture, some results were obtained (see a review paper [10]) under some further restriction on function $f(x)$ at $x = \infty$ or structure of time-frequency shifts $\Lambda$. Firstly, we list some results if function $f$ satisfies certain decay property at infinity.

- $\mathcal{G}(f, \Lambda)$ is linearly independent if $f$ is compactly supported, or just supported within a half-line $[a, \infty)$ or $(-\infty, a]$ [9].
- $\mathcal{G}(f, \Lambda)$ is linearly independent if $f = p(x)e^{-x^2}$, where $p$ is a polynomial [9].

- $\mathcal{G}(f,\Lambda)$ is linearly independent [2] if

$$\lim_{x\to+\infty}|f(x)|e^{cx\ln x}=0 \text{ for all } c>0.$$

  See [3] for higher dimension.
- $\mathcal{G}(f,\Lambda)$ is linearly independent if $\#\Lambda\leq 4$, $f$ is ultimately positive, and $f(x)$, $f(-x)$ are ultimately decreasing [1], where $\#A$ is the size of the finite set $A$.

Secondly, we review some results if $\Lambda$ has a certain structure:

- $\mathcal{G}(f,\Lambda)$ is linearly independent if $\#\Lambda\leq 3$ or $\Lambda$ is colinear [9].
- $\mathcal{G}(f,\Lambda)$ is linearly independent if $\Lambda$ is a finite subset of a translate of a full-rank lattice in $\mathbb{R}^2$ [12]. See [4, 6] for an alternative proof.
- $\mathcal{G}(f,\Lambda)$ is linearly independent if $\Lambda$ is a (2,2) configuration [5, 7].
- $\mathcal{G}(f,\Lambda)$ is linearly independent if $\Lambda$ is a (1,3) configuration (some restrictions is needed)[5]. See Theorem 1.1.

Recall that we call $\Lambda$ an $(n,m)$ configuration if there exist 2 distinct parallel lines containing $\Lambda$ such that one of them contains exactly $n$ points of $\Lambda$, and the other one contains exactly $m$ points of $\Lambda$.

In this paper, we consider the $(1,3)$ configuration. One of results in [5] is

**Theorem 1.1.** *HRT conjecture holds for special* $(1,3)$ *configurations*

$$\Lambda=\{(0,0),(\alpha,0),(\beta,0),(0,1)\},$$

(a) *if there exists* $\gamma>1$ *such that*

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} n^{\gamma}\min\{||n\frac{\beta}{\alpha}||,||n\frac{\alpha}{\beta}||\}<\infty, \tag{1}$$

(b) *if at least one of* $\alpha,\beta$ *is rational.*

It is known that $\{x\in\mathbb{R}:$ there exists some $\gamma>1$ such that $\liminf_{n\to\infty} n^{\gamma}||nx||<\infty\}$ is a set of zero Lebesgue measure, see Theorem 32 in [11]. Thus Theorem 1.1 holds for a measure 0 subset of parameters.

Our main work in the present paper is to extend Demeter's result. That is

**Theorem 1.2.** *HRT conjecture holds for special* $(1,3)$ *configurations*

$$\Lambda=\{(0,0),(\alpha,0),(\beta,0),(0,1)\},$$

(a) *if*

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} n\ln n\min\{||n\frac{\beta}{\alpha}||,||n\frac{\alpha}{\beta}||\}<\infty, \tag{2}$$

(b) *if at least one of* $\alpha,\beta$ *is rational.*

It is well known that $\{x\in\mathbb{R}:\liminf_{n\to\infty} n\ln n||nx||<\infty\}$ is a set of full Lebesgue measure, also see Theorem 32 in [11]. Then by metaplectic transformation, we have the following theorem

**Theorem 1.3.** *HRT conjecture holds for almost every (with respect to Lebesgue measure)* $(1,3)$ *configuration.*

## 2. The framework of the proof of Theorems 1.2 and 1.3

Theorem 1.3 follows from Theorem 1.2 directly if we apply metaplectic transformation(see [9]). Thus we only need to prove Theorem 1.2. It suffices to consider the case that both $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are irrational, by (b) of Theorem 1.1. If $\frac{\alpha}{\beta}$ is a rational number, it reduces to the lattice case, which has been proved [12]. Thus we also assume $\frac{\alpha}{\beta}$ is irrational.

Assume Theorem 1.2 does not hold. Then there exists some function $f$ satisfying

$$\lim_{|n|\to\infty} |f(x+n)| = 0 \text{ a.e. } x \in [0,1) \tag{3}$$

and nonzero $C_i \in \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$f(x+1) = f(x)(C_0 + C_1 e^{2\pi i\alpha x} + C_2 e^{2\pi i\beta x}) \text{ a.e. } x \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{4}$$

(Theorem 1.2 is covered by the known results if $C_i = 0$ for some $i = 0, 1, 2$)

Denote by

$$P(x) = C_0 + C_1 e^{2\pi i\alpha x} + C_2 e^{2\pi i\beta x},$$

and for $n > 0$,

$$P_n(x) = \prod_{j=0}^{n} P(x+j),$$

$$P_{-n}(x) = \prod_{j=-n}^{-1} P(x+j).$$

Notice that $P(x+n)$ is an almost periodic function, so for almost every $x \in [0,1)$,

$$P(x+n) \neq 0 \text{ for any } n \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Iterating (4) $n$ times in both sides (positive and negative), we have for $n > 0$,

$$f(x+n) = P_n(x)f(x) \text{ a.e. } x \in [0,1), \tag{5}$$

$$f(x-n) = P_{-n}(x)^{-1}f(x) \text{ a.e. } x \in [0,1). \tag{6}$$

This implies the value of function $f$ on $\mathbb{R}$ can be determined uniquely by its value on $[0,1)$ and function $P(x)$.

By Egoroff's Theorem and condition (3), and (5), (6), there exists some positive Lebesgue measure set $S \subset [0,1)$ and $d > 0$, such that

$$\lim_{|n|\to\infty} f(x+n) = 0 \text{ uniformly for } x \in S, \tag{7}$$

$$d < |f(x)| < d^{-1} \text{ for all } x \in S \tag{8}$$

and

$$f(x+n) = P_n(x)f(x) \text{ for all } x \in S, \tag{9}$$

$$f(x-n) = P_{-n}(x)^{-1}f(x) \text{ for all } x \in S. \tag{10}$$

Demeter constructed a sequence $\{n_k\} \subset \mathbb{Z}^+$, such that

$$|P_{n_k}(x_k)P_{-n_k}(x'_k)^{-1}| \geq C \tag{11}$$

for some $x_k, x'_k \in S$. This contradicts to (7), (8), (9) and (10).

In order to complete the construction of (11), growth condition (1) is necessary in paper [5]. In the present paper, we follow the main idea of paper [5], but both make the restriction

weaker, and significantly simplify the proof. The rest of the paper is organized as follows: In §3, we will give some basic facts. In §4, we give the proof of Theorem 1.2.

## 3. Preliminaries

We start with some basic notations. Denote by $[x]$, $\{x\}$, $\|x\|$ the integer part, the fractional part and the distance to the nearest integer of $x$. Let $\langle x\rangle$ be the unique number in $[-1/2, 1/2)$ such that $x-\langle x\rangle$ is an integer. For measurable set $A \subset \mathbb{R}$, denote by $|A|$ its Lebesgue measure.

For any irrational number $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, we define

$$a_0 = [\alpha], \alpha_0 = \alpha,$$

and inductively for $k > 0$,

$$a_k = [\alpha_{k-1}^{-1}], \alpha_k = \alpha_{k-1}^{-1} - a_k. \tag{12}$$

We define

$$\begin{array}{ll} p_0 = a_0, & q_0 = 1, \\ p_1 = a_0 a_1 + 1, & q_1 = a_1, \end{array}$$

and inductively,

$$\begin{aligned} p_k &= a_k p_{k-1} + p_{k-2}, \\ q_k &= a_k q_{k-1} + q_{k-2}. \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

Recall that $\{q_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is the sequence of denominators of best approximations of irrational number $\alpha$, since it satisfies

$$\forall 1 \le k < q_{n+1}, \|k\alpha\| \ge ||q_n\alpha||. \tag{14}$$

Moreover, we also have the following estimate,

$$\frac{1}{2q_{n+1}} \le \|q_n\alpha\| \le \frac{1}{q_{n+1}}. \tag{15}$$

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let $k_1 < k_2 < k_3 < \cdots < k_m$ be a monotone integer sequence with $k_m - k_1 < q_n$. Suppose for some $x \in \mathbb{R}$*

$$\min_{j=1,2\cdots,m} ||k_j\alpha - x|| \ge \frac{1}{4q_n}. \tag{16}$$

*Then*

$$\sum_{j=1,2\cdots,m} \frac{1}{||k_j\alpha - x||} \le Cq_n \ln q_n.$$

*Proof.* By (14) and (15), one has

$$||(k_i\alpha - x) - (k_j\alpha - x)|| \ge \frac{1}{2q_n} \text{ if } i \ne j.$$

Combining with (16), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1,2\cdots,m} \frac{1}{||k_j\alpha - x||} &\le \sum_{j=1}^{q_n} C\frac{q_n}{j} \\ &\le Cq_n \ln q_n. \end{aligned}$$

□

Now we give two lemmas which can be found in [5].

**Lemma 3.2.** *(Lemma 2.1,[5]) Let $C_0, C_1, C_2 \in \mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\}$. The polynomial $p(x,y) = C_0 + C_1 e^{2\pi i x} + C_2 e^{2\pi i y}$ has at most two real zeros $(\gamma_1^{(j)}, \gamma_2^{(j)}) \in [0,1)^2$, $j \in \{1,2\}$. There exists $t = t(C_0, C_1, C_2) \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ such that*

$$|p(x,y)| \geq C(C_0, C_1, C_2) \min_{j=1,2} (\|x - \gamma_1^j + t\langle y - \gamma_2^j \rangle\| + \|x - \gamma_1^j\|^2 + \|y - \gamma_2^j\|^2),$$

*for each $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$.*

**Lemma 3.3.** *(Lemma 4.1,[5]) Let $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_N$ be $N$ not necessarily distinct real numbers. Then for each $N \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and each $\delta > 0$, there exists a set $E_{N,\delta} \subset [0,1)$ with $|E_{N,\delta}| \leq \delta$, such that*

$$\sum_{n=1}^{N} \frac{1}{\|x - x_n\|} \leq C(\delta) N \log N, \tag{17}$$

*and*

$$\sum_{n=1}^{N} \frac{1}{\|x - x_n\|^2} \leq C(\delta) N^2, \tag{18}$$

*for each $x \in [0,1) \setminus E_{N,\delta}$.*

## 4. Proof of Theorems 1.2

Let $q_k, p_k, a_k$ be the coefficients of continued fraction expansion to $\frac{\alpha}{\beta}$ as given in (12) and (13). Then condition (2) holds iff

$$\limsup_k \frac{a_k}{\ln q_k} > 0 \tag{19}$$

or

$$\limsup_k \frac{q_{k+1}}{q_k \ln q_k} > 0.$$

**Lemma 4.1.** *Suppose $\frac{\alpha}{\beta}$ is irrational and satisfies condition (2). Then for any $s \in (0,1)$, there exists a sequence $N_k$ such that*

(i)

$$N_k = m_{n_k} q_{n_k}, m_{n_k} \leq C(s), \tag{20}$$

(ii)

$$||N_k \frac{\alpha}{\beta}|| \leq \frac{C(s)}{N_k \ln N_k}, \tag{21}$$

(iii)

$$\{\frac{N_k}{\beta}\} \leq s. \tag{22}$$

*Proof.* By (19), there exists a sequence $n_k$ such that $a_{n_k} \geq c \ln q_{n_k}$. For any $s \in (0,1)$, let $1 \leq m_{n_k} \leq 1/s + 1$ such that $N_k = m_{n_k} q_{n_k}$ satisfies (iii) (this can be done by the Pigeonhole principle). It is easy to check that $N_k$ satisfies condition (ii) by the fact $a_{n_k} \geq c \ln q_{n_k}$. □

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let $C_0, C_1, C_2 \in \mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\}$ and $\alpha, \beta$ be such that $\frac{\alpha}{\beta}$ is irrational. Let $Q_k$ be a sequence such that $\gamma q_{n_k} \leq Q_k \leq \hat{\gamma} q_{n_k}$, where $q_n$ is the continued fraction expansion to $\frac{\alpha}{\beta}$ and $\gamma, \hat{\gamma}$ are constants. Define*

$$P(x) = C_0 + C_1 e^{2\pi i \alpha x} + C_2 e^{2\pi i \beta x}.$$

*Then for each $\delta > 0$, there exists a set $E_{Q_k,\delta} \subset [0,1)$ such that*

$$|E_{Q_k,\delta}| < \delta$$

*and*

$$\sum_{n=0}^{Q_k-1} \frac{1}{|P(x+n)|} \leq C(\gamma,\hat{\gamma},\delta,C_0,C_1,C_2,\alpha,\beta)Q_k \ln Q_k$$

*for each $x \in [0,1) \setminus E_{Q_k,\delta}$.*

*Proof.* In order to make the proof simpler, we will write constant $C$ for constants depending on $\gamma,\hat{\gamma},\delta,C_0,C_1,C_2,\alpha,\beta$.

Let $(\gamma_1,\gamma_2)$ be a zero of the polynomial $p(x,y) = C_0 + C_1 e^{2\pi i x} + C_2 e^{2\pi i y}$, and let $t$ be the real number given by Lemma 3.2. Define

$$A_n(x) := \|\alpha(x+n) - \gamma_1 + t\langle\beta(x+n) - \gamma_2\rangle\| + \|\alpha(x+n) - \gamma_1\|^2 + \|\beta(x+n) - \gamma_2\|^2.$$

By Lemma 3.2, it suffices to find a set with $|E_{Q_k,\delta}| \leq \delta$, such that

$$\sum_{n=0}^{Q_k-1} \frac{1}{A_n(x)} \leq CQ_k \ln Q_k, \tag{23}$$

for each $x \in [0,1) \setminus E_{Q_k,\delta}$.

We distinguish two cases.

**Case 1:** $\alpha + t\beta \neq 0$

In this case, one has

$$\|\alpha(x+n) - \gamma_1 + t\langle\beta(x+n) - \gamma_2\rangle\| = \|(\alpha+t\beta)x + (\alpha+t\beta)n - \gamma_1 - t\gamma_2 - t[\beta(x+n) - \gamma_2] + mt\|,$$

where $m = -1$ if $\{\beta(x+n) - \gamma_2\} > 1/2$ and $m = 0$ otherwise.

Note that the set

$$S := \{(\alpha+t\beta)n - \gamma_1 - t\gamma_2 - t[\beta(x+n) - \gamma_2] + mt : \ x \in [0,1),\ 0 \leq n \leq Q_k - 1,\ m \in \{0,-1\}\}$$

has $O(Q_k)$ elements. By (17) there exists some $E^1_{Q_k,\delta}$ with $|E^1_{Q_k,\delta}| < \delta/2$ such that

$$\sum_{y \in S} \frac{1}{\|(\alpha+t\beta)x + y\|} \leq CQ_k \ln Q_k$$

for each $x \in [0,1) \setminus E^1_{Q_k,\delta}$. This implies (23).

**Case 2:** $\alpha + t\beta = 0$.

In this case, one has

$$\|\alpha(x+n) - \gamma_1 + t\langle\beta(x+n) - \gamma_2\rangle\| = \| - \gamma_1 - t\gamma_2 + mt + \frac{\alpha}{\beta}[\beta(x+n) - \gamma_2]\|,$$

where $m$ is as before. Let $\xi$ be either $\gamma_1 + t\gamma_2$ or $\gamma_1 + t\gamma_2 + t$, depending on whether $m = 0$ or $-1$. From Lemma 3.1 we have that for each $x \in [0,1)$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{n=0 \\ \|\frac{\alpha}{\beta}[\beta(x+n)-\gamma_2]-\xi\| \geq \frac{1}{4q_{n_k}}}}^{Q_k-1} \frac{1}{\|\frac{\alpha}{\beta}[\beta(x+n)-\gamma_2]-\xi\|} &\leq C \sum_{\substack{n=0 \\ \|\frac{\alpha}{\beta}n-\xi\| \geq \frac{1}{4q_{n_k}}}}^{CQ_k} \frac{1}{\|\frac{\alpha}{\beta}n-\xi\|} \\ &\leq CQ_k \ln Q_k. \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Let $S(\xi)$ (not depending on $x$) be the set of those $0 \leq n \leq Q_k - 1$ such that $\|\frac{\alpha}{\beta}[\beta(x+n) - \gamma_2] - \xi\| \leq \frac{1}{4q_{n_k}}$ for some $x \in [0,1)$. It is easy to see that $\#S(\xi) \leq C$ by (14) and (15). For $n \in S(\xi)$, we will use an alternative estimate

$$A_n(x) \geq \|\alpha(x+n) - \gamma_1\|^2.$$

By (18), there exists set $E^2_{Q_k,\delta} \subset [0,1)$ with $|E^2_{Q_k,\delta}| \le \frac{\delta}{2}$ such that

$$\sum_{\substack{n=0 \\ \|\frac{\alpha}{\beta}[\beta(x+n)-\gamma_2]-\xi\| \le \frac{1}{4q_{n_k}}}}^{Q_k-1} \frac{1}{A_n(x)} \le C \sum_{\substack{n=0 \\ \|\frac{\alpha}{\beta}[\beta(x+n)-\gamma_2]-\xi\| \le \frac{1}{4q_{n_k}}}}^{Q_k-1} \frac{1}{\|\alpha(x+n)-\gamma_1\|^2}$$

$$\le C(\delta), \tag{25}$$

for each $x \in [0,1) \setminus E^2_{Q_k,\delta}$. Thus the theorem now follows from (24) and (25).

□

**Theorem 4.3.** *Under the conditions of Lemma 4.2, let $N_k$ be a sequence such that (i), (ii) and (iii) in Lemma 4.1 hold. Define $P_k := \frac{N_k}{\beta}$ for $\beta > 0$ and $P_k := -\frac{N_k}{\beta}$ for $\beta < 0$. Given $\delta > 0$, there exists $E_{k,\delta} \subset [0,1)$ with $|E_{k,\delta}| \le \delta$ such that for each $x, y$ satisfying $x \in [0,1) \setminus E_{k,\delta}$ and $x = y + P_k$, we have*

$$|\prod_{n=0}^{[P_k]-1} P(y+n)| \le C(\delta, s, C_0, C_1, C_2, \alpha, \beta)|\prod_{n=0}^{[P_k]-1} P(x+n)|.$$

*Proof.* We write $C$ for $C(\delta, s, C_0, C_1, C_2, \alpha, \beta)$ again. Without loss of generality, we only consider the case $\beta > 0$.

By (21) we have

$$|e^{2\pi i\alpha x} - e^{2\pi i\alpha y}| = |e^{2\pi i N_k \frac{\alpha}{\beta}} - 1| \le \frac{C}{P_k \ln P_k}$$

and

$$|e^{2\pi i\beta x} - e^{2\pi i\beta y}| = 0.$$

Thus, for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, one has

$$|P(y+n)| \le |P(x+n)| + \frac{C}{P_k \ln P_k}.$$

By the fact $1 + x \le e^x$ for $x > 0$, we get

$$|P(y+n)| \le |P(x+n)| e^{\frac{C}{P_k \ln P_k |P(x+n)|}},$$

and thus

$$|\prod_{n=0}^{[P_k]-1} P(y+n)| \le |\prod_{n=0}^{[P_k]-1} P(x+n)| e^{\frac{C}{P_k \ln P_k} \sum_{n=0}^{[P_k]-1} \frac{1}{|P(x+n)|}}.$$

Then Theorem 4.3 follows from Lemma 4.2. □

**Proof of Theorem 1.2**

*Proof.* Otherwise, there exist some function $f$, positive Lebesgue measure set $S \subset [0,1)$ and $d > 0$ such that (7), (8), (9) and (10) hold. Applying Theorem 4.3 with $s, \delta$(will be given later), we have

$$|\prod_{n=0}^{[P_k]-1} P(y+n)| \le C|\prod_{n=0}^{[P_k]-1} P(x+n)|, \tag{26}$$

for each $x \in [0,1) \setminus E_{k,\delta}$ and $x = y + P_k$.

By the continuity of Lebesgue measure, there exists $s = \varepsilon(S) > 0$ such that

$$|S \cup (\{P_k\} + S)| \le \frac{101}{100}|S|,$$

for $\{P_k\} \leq s$. Let $\delta = \frac{|S|}{100}$. Then $(S \setminus E_{k,\delta}) \cap (\{P_k\} + S) \neq \emptyset$. Now we can choose $x_k \in S \setminus E_{k,\delta}$ such that $x_k - \{P_k\} \in S$. Let $y_k = x'_k - [P_k] = x_k - P_k$. Then

$$\prod_{n=0}^{[P_k]-1} P(y_k + n) = \prod_{n=1}^{[P_k]} P(x'_k - n).$$

Combining with (26), we get

$$|\prod_{n=1}^{[P_k]} P(x'_k - n)| \leq C|\prod_{n=0}^{[P_k]-1} P(x_k + n)|.$$

Applying (9) and (10) with $x_k, x'_k \in S$, one has

$$f(x_k + [P_k]) = f(x_k) \prod_{n=0}^{[P_k]-1} P(x_k + n)$$

$$f(x'_k - [P_k]) = f(x'_k)(\prod_{n=1}^{[P_k]} P(x'_k - n))^{-1}.$$

Combining with (8), we get that

$$|f(x_k + [P_k])f(x'_k - [P_k])| \geq \frac{d^2}{C}.$$

This contradicts (7), if we let $k \to \infty$. □

## Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Svetlana Jitomirskaya for introducing to me the HRT conjecture and inspiring discussions on this subject. This research was partially supported by the AMS-Simons Travel Grant (2016-2018) and NSF DMS-1401204.

## References

[1] J. J. Benedetto and A. Bourouihiya. Linear independence of finite Gabor systems determined by behavior at infinity. *J. Geom. Anal.*, 25(1):226–254, 2015.
[2] M. Bownik and D. Speegle. Linear independence of time-frequency translates of functions with faster than exponential decay. *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.*, 45(3):554–566, 2013.
[3] M. Bownik and D. Speegle. Linear independence of time-frequency translates in $\mathbb{R}^d$. *J. Geom. Anal.*, 26(3):1678–1692, 2016.
[4] M. Bownik, D. Speegle, et al. Linear independence of Parseval wavelets. *Illinois Journal of Mathematics*, 54(2):771–785, 2010.
[5] C. Demeter. Linear independence of time frequency translates for special configurations. *Math. Res. Lett.*, 17(4):761–779, 2010.
[6] C. Demeter and S. Z. Gautam. On the finite linear independence of lattice Gabor systems. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 141(5):1735–1747, 2013.
[7] C. Demeter and A. Zaharescu. Proof of the HRT conjecture for $(2, 2)$ configurations. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 388(1):151–159, 2012.
[8] C. Heil. Linear independence of finite gabor systems. In *Harmonic analysis and applications*, pages 171–206. Springer, 2006.
[9] C. Heil, J. Ramanathan, and P. Topiwala. Linear independence of time-frequency translates. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 124(9):2787–2795, 1996.
[10] C. Heil and D. Speegle. The HRT conjecture and the zero divisor conjecture for the Heisenberg group. In *Excursions in harmonic analysis. Vol. 3*, Appl. Numer. Harmon. Anal., pages 159–176. Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham, 2015.
[11] A. Y. Khinchin. Continued fractions. 1997.

[12] P. A. Linnell. von Neumann algebras and linear independence of translates. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 127(11):3269–3277, 1999.

(Wencai Liu) Department of Mathematics, University of California, Irvine, California 92697-3875, USA

*E-mail address*: liuwencai1226@gmail.com